	Case 2:19-cv-02611-KJM-DMC Docume	nt 19	Filed 01/12/22	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
11					
12	JERREL WILLIAMS,	No	o. 2:19-CV-2611-	KJM DMC P	
13	Plaintiff,				
14	v.	OI	<u>RDER</u>		
15	WONG, et al.,				
16	Defendants.				
17		]			
18	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §				
19	1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Eastern				
20	District of California local rules.				
21	On October 27, 2021, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations, which				
22	were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file objections within				
23	the time specified therein. No objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.				
24	The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602				
25	F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed <i>de novo</i> .				
26	See Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the				
27	magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court").				
28	Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by  1				

	Case 2:19-cv-02611-KJM-DMC Document 19 Filed 01/12/22 Page 2 of 2				
1	the record and by the proper analysis.				
2	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:				
3	1. The findings and recommendations, ECF No. 12, are adopted in full; <sup>1</sup>				
4	2. Cates and Lizarraga are dismissed as defendants to this action for failure t				
5	state a claim;				
6	3. The case shall proceed on plaintiff's Eighth Amendment medical care				
7	claim against defendant Wong only; and				
8	4. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further				
9	pretrial proceedings.				
10	DATED: January 11, 2022.				
11	100 000				
12	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
13	CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26	The court does not adopt the engagent type amount is a second of first and which in line to all intiger 1.1 and 1.1 an				
27	<sup>1</sup> The court does not adopt the apparent typographical errors on the first page, which indicate plaintiff did not file a first amended complaint. <i>See</i> Finding and Recommendation at 1, ECF No. 1. Th operative complaint is plaintiff's				

first amended complaint. First Am. Compl., ECF No. 8. The magistrate judge ordered plaintiff to file a second

amended complaint. Prev. Order (Aug. 4, 2021), ECF No. 10, and plaintiff has not complied.

28